



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,530	05/31/2001	Chia-Hsing Chen	148693.00367	1349

7590 12/31/2002

POWELL, GOLDSTEIN, FRAZER & MURPHY LLP  
P.O. BOX 97223  
WASHINGTON, DC 20090-7223

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ROCCHEGIANI, RENZO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2825	

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/870,530	CHEN, CHIA-HSING	
	Examiner Renzo N. Rocchegiani	Art Unit 2825	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
<b>Period for Reply</b>			
<b>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b>			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 October 2002</u> .			
2a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.                    2b) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.			
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b>			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .	

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,733 (Feria et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,972,783 (Arai et al.)

Feria et al. disclose a process to form memory cells wherein a p-type semiconductor substrate is provided (col. 8, lines 15-25), whereon a dielectric layer is formed (Fig. 2). On the dielectric layer a photoresist layer is formed and patterned to expose a portion of the dielectric layer. (Fig. 3) An ion-implantation is performed to form pocket dopant regions (Fig. 5-6) and a second doping step is performed to form N-type ion-implanting regions in the p-type semiconductor substrate so as to form source and drain regions. (Fig. 4) Once the implantation steps have been performed the photoresist layers are removed. (Fig. 7).

Ferla et al. do not disclose the use of indium for the pocket implantation formation step.

Arai et al. teach a process for producing MOS transistor wherein a ion implantation step to form pocket regions comprises the implantation of indium. (col. 20, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the specific art to combine the teachings of Arai et al. to the invention disclosed by Ferla et al., since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

3. Claims 2-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,733 (Ferla et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,972,783 (Arai et al.) and in further view of U.S. Patent N. 4,937,756 (Hsu et al.).

As stated in paragraph 2, all the limitations of the claims have been met except for teaching that the dielectric layer comprises ONO.

Ferla et al. disclose a dielectric layer comprises an oxide. (col. 4, lines 10-13).

Hsu et al. teach a process to form a gate structure wherein the gate insulation layer comprises an oxide that may be supplemented with deposited silicon nitride and oxynitride. (col. 3, lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the specific art to combine the teachings of Hsu et al. to those of Eitan, since Hsu et al. teach that ONO structure would be the preferred material to be used thanks to its properties. (Hsu et al., col. 3, lines 48-55).

4. Claims 6, 9-11 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,733 (Feria et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,972,783 (Arai et al.) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,030,871 (Eitan).

Feria et al. disclose a process to form memory cells wherein a p-type

semiconductor substrate is provided (col. 8, lines 15-25), whereon a dielectric layer is formed (Fig. 2). On the dielectric layer a photoresist layer is formed and patterned to expose a portion of the dielectric layer. (Fig. 3) The dielectric layer is then etched using the photoresist layer as a mask. (Fig. 3) An ion-implantation is performed to form pocket dopant regions (Fig. 5-6) and a second doping step is performed to form N-type ion-implanting regions in the p-type semiconductor substrate so as to form source and drain regions. (Fig. 4) Once the implantation steps have been performed the photoresist layers are removed. (Fig. 7).

Ferla et al. do not disclose the use of indium for the pocket implantation formation step. Ferla et al. also do not disclose the use of multi-layer photoresists.

Arai et al. teach a process for producing MOS transistor wherein a ion implantation step to form pocket regions comprises the implantation of indium. (col. 20, lines 15-20).

Eitan et al. teach the formation of memory cell with the implantation of pocket regions as well as source and drain regions wherein a plurality of photoresists layers are used. (Fig. 4C, 4E).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the specific art to combine the teachings of Lin et al. to the invention disclosed by Ferla et al., since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

*In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

It would have also been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the specific art to combine the teachings of Eitan to the invention disclosed by Ferla et al., since such process would provide an efficient way to form self-aligned pocket implants. (Eitan, col. 2, lines 1-8).

5. Claims 7-8, 12-13, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,733 (Ferla et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. (Arai et al.) and of U.S. Patent No. 6,030,871 (Eitan) and in further view of U.S. Patent N. 4,937,756 (Hsu et al.).

As stated in paragraph 4, all the limitations of the claims have been met except for teaching that the dielectric layer comprises ONO.

Ferla et al. disclose a dielectric layer comprises an oxide. (col. 4, lines 10-13).

Hsu et al. teach a process to form a gate structure wherein the gate insulation layer comprises an oxide that may be supplemented with deposited silicon nitride and oxynitride. (col. 3, lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the specific art to combine the teachings of Hsu et al. to those of Ferla et al., since Hsu et al. teach that ONO structure would be the preferred material to be used thanks to its properties. (Hsu et al., col. 3, lines 48-55).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on October 15, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the present invention is not rendered obvious by the above-cited references because there is no motivation to choose indium

over the other species in the implantation step. The examiner does not agree with applicant and does not deem applicant's arguments to be persuasive. The secondary reference, i.e. Arai et al., teach the use of indium as an impurity. This teaching is enough to obviate the use of this material for the implantation step. Under 35 USC 103 there must be a motivation to use the material, but there is no requirements that the reference teach additional benefits or properties from using a specific material. Even though the presence of such information would supplement the motivation to use the material it is not required where the secondary reference teaches that the material can be substituted for another. A person with ordinary skill in the art would read Arai et al. and know that indium is an element that is used to form the doped region in the Feria et al. invention. This is enough to provide motivation because, as stated above, selecting a material on the basis of its suitability for its intended use is a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*. Thus, the rejection as previously presented stands and it is hereby made final.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renzo Rocchegiani whose telephone number is (703) 308-5839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith, can be reached at (703) 308-1323. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9318.

RNR

December 27, 2002



MATTHEW SMITH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800